E3RVRODN Arraig	nment
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	Σ.
NITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
V.	10 CR 905 (LTS)
MANUEL RODRIGUEZ-PEREZ,	
Defendant.	
x	\$
	New York, N.Y. March 27, 2014 4:40 p.m.
Da franco	
Before:	
HON. LAURA	TAYLOR SWAIN,
	District Judge
APPEA	ARANCES
PREET BHARARA, United States Attorney for	
Southern District of New York AMIE N. ELY ANDREW C. ADAMS Assistant United States Attorneys	York
	torneys
RICHARD W. LEVITT PETER E. QUIJANO Attorneys for Defendant	
ALSO PRESENT: PATRICIA TRIANA,	Spanish Interpreter

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Case called)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: This case is United States of America v. Manuel Rodriguez-Perez.

THE COURT: Counsel.

MS. ELY: Good afternoon, your Honor.

Amie Ely for the government.

With me at counsel table is AUSA Andrew Adams.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Ely and Mr. Adams.

MR. LEVITT: And for Mr. Rodriguez, Richard Levitt and Peter Quijano.

Good afternoon, Judge.

MR. QUIJANO: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Levitt and Mr.

Quijano. Good afternoon, Mr. Rodriguez-Perez.

MR. QUIJANO: If your Honor please, present in court also is the official court interpreter. Mr. Rodriguez-Perez has indicated he does not need the services of the interpreter. We believe most of the times we've appeared he has not used one. At any rate, he insists that he is fine; to proceed without the interpreter at this point.

THE COURT: Are you confident, based on your interactions with Mr. Rodriguez-Perez, that we are able to proceed with appropriate English-language comprehension without the interpreter?

MR. QUIJANO: I am, your Honor.

I've also advised him that if at any time he feels he 1 is missing something, he should just alert me, and obviously 2 3 I'll tell the Court. He believes he can proceed. I agree with 4 him. 5 THE COURT: And so, Mr. Rodriguez, do you want me to ask the interpreter to stay here on a standby basis? 6 7 THE DEFENDANT: (In English) Yeah, that's okay. THE COURT: And so, Madam Interpreter, if you don't 8 9 mind, I would ask that you stay. 10 Mr. Rodriguez, if at any time you believe you need the 11 assistance of the interpreter, just let Mr. Quijano know or 12 raise your hand. 13 And at this point, I'm going to ask that the interpreter take the interpretation oath in case she needs to 14 begin working. 15 16 (Interpreter sworn) 17 THE COURT: Thank you. 18 Mr. Rodriguez, are these members of your family here 19 in court today? 20 THE DEFENDANT: No. 21 THE COURT: No? Sorry. 22 Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I apologize for 23 the misunderstanding. Thank you for coming to court today. 24 All right. So we have a new superseding indictment, a

38th superseding indictment.

Ms. Ely, would you summarize for the record the differences from the S31.

3

MS. ELY: Yes, your Honor.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

The primary difference is the addition of a total of five new attempted murders which are charged as predicate acts in Count One, which now alleges 23 separate predicate acts and five additional murders which are alleged both as predicate acts in Count One and as various substantive counts throughout the indictment.

Would the Court like for me to explain in more detail the additional charges?

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MS. ELY: Your Honor, the first additional charge as to Manuel Rodriguez is charged in Count One as the second predicate act. It pertains to the attempted murder and conspiracy to murder an individual referred to as Victim 1 from on or about July 16th, 1996, to 2010. This victim was originally alleged as the intended victim of a murder that Orlando Rodriguez was charged with only in the S31 indictment. But the government's investigation has revealed that Manuel Rodriguez made attempts to later locate and kill this victim.

The next addition to the indictment is Predicate Act 3, which alleges the attempted murder of a victim on or about August 21st, 1996, here in the New York City area.

Next is Predicate Act 4, which alleges the attempted

murder and conspiracy to murder Victims 3 and 4, as they're named in the indictment, on or about June 27th, 1997, here in the New York City area.

The next addition is the attempted murder and conspiracy to murder a victim labeled as Victim 5 on or about January 3rd, 1998. This is alleged as Predicate Act 6. This also occurred here in the New York City area.

The next addition is alleged both as Predicate Act 10 and as substantive counts in the indictment; specifically, the murder and conspiracy to murder Noel Herrera on or about December 29th, 2001. That occurred in the Dominican Republic.

The next is alleged as Predicate Act 11 in the first count of the indictment, as well as counts that are substantively charged throughout the indictment. This is the murder and conspiracy to murder Kelly Perez, whose nickname was Red, on or about September 16th, 2002, here on 156th Street in Manhattan.

The next alleged is Predicate Act 12, which is the murder and conspiracy to murder Marino Molina on or about January 11th, 2003, in the Dominican Republic. It's also charged as various substantive counts throughout the indictment.

The next is alleged as Predicate Act 15 in Count One.

It's the murder and conspiracy to murder Manuel Rivas, whose nickname was Tony Almono. That occurred on or about October

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

29th, 2005, in the Dominican Republic. That's also alleged as substantive counts in the indictment.

And finally, Predicate Act 19, which is the murder and conspiracy to murder Sadelino Delgado Garcia on or about May 1st, 2011. That occurred in the Dominican Republic, and it occurred while Mr. Rodriquez was incarcerated in this case.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Ely.

Mr. Rodriguez and his counsel, please stand.

Messrs. Quijano and Levitt, have you reviewed the S38 indictment?

MR. LEVITT: Yes.

THE COURT: And have you discussed it with

13 Mr. Rodriguez?

> MR. LEVITT: Yes. But he hasn't read it yet, but we've discussed it. But we're prepared to enter a not-guilty plea.

THE COURT: And so you believe he's sufficiently familiar with the new allegations in the indictment to make the entry of a not-quilty plea at this point?

MR. LEVITT: Correct.

THE COURT: And informed.

MR. LEVITT: Correct.

THE COURT: As you know, it is my practice also to address the defendant directly. So, Mr. Rodriguez, would you please stand.

1	Would you please state your full name.
2	THE DEFENDANT: (In English) Excuse me?
3	THE COURT: Would you please state your full name.
4	THE DEFENDANT: (In English) Manuel Jovanni Rodriguez.
5	THE COURT: Mr. Rodriguez, have your attorneys
6	discussed this new indictment, which is No. S38, with you?
7	THE DEFENDANT: (In English) Yes.
8	THE COURT: Do you understand the charges against you?
9	THE DEFENDANT: (In English) Yes, I do, your Honor.
10	THE COURT: If you want me to, I can read the whole
11	indictment to you out loud here in court. Do you want me to
12	read it to you?
13	THE DEFENDANT: (In English) I will prefer no, if
14	that's okay with you, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: It's fine. It is your choice.
16	And so how do you plead to the charges against you in
17	the indictment, not guilty or guilty?
18	THE DEFENDANT: (In English) Not guilty.
19	THE COURT: Thank you. You can be seated.
20	Ms. Ely, would you please bring me up to speed on the
21	status of the government's process with Main Justice, and how,
22	if at all, it's affected by the superseding indictment.
23	MS. ELY: Your Honor, we've been awaiting a mitigation
24	submission from defense counsel on the charges that were
25	originally brought in July 2012. I, in fact, advised defense

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

counsel several weeks ago that we expected to return this superseding indictment so that they can begin addressing the new charges in the S38 indictment.

The government's practice is generally not to make any recommendation until we've received mitigation submissions in cases as serious as this one, and so we have not yet begun to have much of a substantive discussion with our counterparts in the District of Columbia.

I understand from defense counsel -- and I'll let them speak for themselves -- that they expect that they may have a mitigation submission to us addressing all of the conduct in the S38 indictment around July of this year.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Quijano.

MR. QUIJANO: If your Honor please, that's accurate. I think that's realistic.

THE COURT: Do you have a sense as to whether it's early July, late July?

MR. QUIJANO: I'm always optimistic, your Honor, but, under the circumstances, I actually will have a better idea probably in a week or two.

THE COURT: Very well then.

Is there anything else that you wish to raise with the Court at this point from the defense perspective?

MR. LEVITT: No, your Honor.

1	MR. QUIJANO: No, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Thank you.
3	I believe we have our next conference scheduled for
4	May 19th. Is that correct, Ms. Ng?
5	May 19th is the scheduled start date for a trial. So
6	we must have excluded through that date in general in
7	connection with the trial. And so we should set a conference
8	with respect to Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Quijano?
9	MR. QUIJANO: Can I have a moment?
10	THE COURT: Yes.
11	(Pause)
12	MS. ELY: Your Honor, it sounds like June 5th at 2
13	o'clock might work for the parties, if that's available on the
14	Court's calendar.
15	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Thursday, June 5th, 2014, at 4:30.
16	We're on trial. We could do it at 12:45.
17	MR. QUIJANO: Please.
18	THE COURT: All right then.
19	I'll set the next conference for June 5th at 12:45.
20	Ms. Ely, is there a request for exclusion from speedy
21	trial computations?
22	MS. ELY: Yes, your Honor.
23	As I told defense counsel, I expect I'll be producing
24	some discovery by as early as this coming Monday, and will
25	endeavor to produce the rest of the discovery that relates to

the new incidents by around April 28.

In light of that and in light of the fact that defense counsel will be working on the mitigation submission, the government believes that it is in the interest of justice to exclude time from the speedy trial calculations.

THE COURT: Is there any objection?

MR. LEVITT: No objection.

THE COURT: The request is granted. For the reasons summarized by Ms. Ely, I find that the ends of justice served by the granting of an exclusion from speedy trial computations for the period from today's date through June 5th, 2014 outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. Accordingly, that time period is excluded prospectively.

Mr. Quijano, should we, going forward, have an interpreter present for conferences for Mr. Rodriguez or no?

MR. QUIJANO: Your Honor, I think in the abundance of caution, especially given the nature of these proceedings, I think it's best to have one here.

THE COURT: Then we will.

MR. QUIJANO: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Ely?

MS. ELY: Your Honor, one other thing.

We did endeavor to notify at least the victims in the New York City area. I believe that the individuals who are in

E3RVRODN Arraignment the courtroom are members and friends of the victims in this case. THE COURT: Thank you. Again, good afternoon. And thank you all for coming to court today. And so our next conference will be June 5th at 12:45. We are adjourned.